

Republic of the Philippines
Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS
Diliman, Quezon City

PRELIMINARY REPORT
ON THE
SURVEY OF THE
INTENSIFIED RICE PRODUCTION PROGRAM
IN
LAGUNA AND NUEVA ECIIJA

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
1. Background information about the program	1
2. Coverage of the report	2
3. Organization responsible for the survey	2
4. Objectives of the survey	2
5. Sampling design and coverage of the survey	3
6. General field procedures	4
7. Sample size	4
8. Area covered and assignment of production teams	5
9. Program cooperators	5
10. General Impact of the Program and Types of assistance extended	6
a. Production	
b. Certified seeds	
c. General assistance extended	
d. Fertilizer	
e. Credit facilities	
f. Irrigation	
g. Pest and disease control	
11. Summary of general findings and recommendation	21

APPENDICES

- A. Composition of the Advisory Committee on Evaluation Surveys
- B. Memorandum of Agreement between the Rice and Corn Administration and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, DANR on the conduct of Evaluation Survey of the Intensified Rice Production Program.

ii
List of Tables

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1. Number of sample farmers interviewed by province, 1966	4
2. Area covered and number of teams fielded, by province, 1966	5
3. Classification of cooperators as verified during the survey, by province, 1966	6
4. Palay (palagad) - Yield per hectare in the project areas this year compared with that of last year, by province, 1966	7
5. Number of team coverages reporting yield per hectare of 40 cavans or more, and number of sample farmers using fertilizer, insecticides, etc., by province, 1966	8
6. Number of team coverages reporting yield per hectare below 40 cavans and number of sample farmers using fertilizer, insecticides, etc., by province, 1966	9
7. Number of sample farmers who used and did not use certified seeds in 1966 palay palagad, by province, 1966	10
8. Reasons for not using certified seeds, number of farmers reporting by kind of cooperator reasons given and by province, 1966	10
9. Assistance extended by the team to farm cooperator, by province, 1966	11
10. Number of sample farmers who used and who did not use fertilizer, by province, 1966	14
11. Reasons for not using fertilizer, by province 1966	14
12. Inorganic fertilizer applied in the program areas, quantity and source, by province, 1966	15

Table 13. Sources of loans of sample farmers, by province 1966	16
14. Reasons for not securing loans from ACA: Number of farms reporting by kind of cooperators and province, 1966	17
15. Reasons for preferring other sources: Number of farms reporting, by province, 1966	17
16. Opinions on the supply of irrigation water this palagad season as compared to last year, by province, 1966	18
17. Number of sample farmers who sprayed their farm by province, 1966	19
18. Reasons for not using insecticides or pesticides, etc., by province, 1966	20

Republic of the Philippines
Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS
Diliman, Quezon City

Preliminary Report on the Survey of the Intensified
Rice Production Program

Background information about the Program

One of the major concerns of the present administration is to solve the recurring problem of rice shortage. This could be solved, experts claim, through the optimum allocation and utilization of the proven tools of production and by providing favorable and attractive marketing incentives. Along this line, the government (thru the Rice and Corn Production Coordinating Council, RCPCC) launched a pilot project of intensified rice production covering an aggregate area of 45,000 hectares of effectively irrigated areas devoted to palagad crop in Bataan, Bulacan, Nueva Ecija, Laguna and Pangasinan. This project was designed to bolster production by improving the average yield per hectare by 20 cavans over what is being normally produced in the project areas. To attain this objective, cooperators of the program were extended personalized services by field personnel of the various participating and supporting agencies under the RCPCC on the: (a) use of improved or selected seeds, (b) use of fertilizer, (c) control of pests and diseases, (d) proper use and management of irrigation water and (e) extension of credit assistance.

On the strength of Special Order No. 9, Series of 1966, the pilot program was implemented by the Vice-Chairman and Vice-Coodinator of the RCPCC by initiating and maintaining effective coor-

dination among the personnel of the agencies concerned, namely: the Bureau of Plant Industry, Bureau of Soils, CAP, ACA, UP College of Agriculture, NIA and the ISU.

Coverage of the Report

Pending the completion of the tabulation of the survey reports, this preliminary report will include only a general presentation of the salient results of the survey.

Organization responsible for the survey

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics was responsible for the organization, supervision of the survey as well as the collection of data, processing and analysis of the results.

The conduct of the survey was made possible by a memorandum of agreement executed between the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the Rice and Corn Administration.

The survey guidelines, plans and the survey design (including the preparation of the survey schedules) were prepared by the BAE in consonance with the suggestions and advice of the members of an Advisory Committee on Evaluation Surveys.

Objectives of the survey

1. To assess objectively the impact of the program and to determine whether it achieved its intended goal.

2. To determine the tools of production and other factors contributing to the success or failure of the program and the degree of their effects.

3. To gather other relevant information which may be useful in the formulation of guideposts necessary in the development and implementation of future plans and programs for increased rice production.

Sampling design and coverage of the survey

The survey was undertaken in the provinces of Laguna and Nueva Ecija. All the program cooperators in each province were covered by the survey.

The individual area coverage of each Production Team was treated as an independent stratum. The sampling units (cooperators within each stratum) were classified according to whether they had been assisted or unassisted by the IRPP. Sample cooperators were drawn separately from the list of assisted and unassisted cooperators by simple random sampling. For control (non-cooperators) purposes, some farmers were chosen purposively from within the area coverage of the team.

Individual area coverage refers to the area of assignment of a production team of the IRPP. For the purpose of this survey, it consists of the list of cooperators of a production^{team} during the period February to June, 1966 (palagad season).

Within each stratum, one of every 10 assisted cooperators with a minimum of 2 and one of every 15 unassisted cooperators were interviewed. For every two sample cooperators assisted, one unassisted was also interviewed. Assisted cooperators, as distinguished from unassisted cooperators, are those who received any

form or assistance from the production team such as farm advice, chemicals, fertilizer, etc., during the period February to June, 1966. An unassisted non-cooperator is one who planted palagad this year but was not listed as a cooperator.

General field procedures

A copy of the list of cooperators of each production team was obtained by the field supervisor from the Provincial Operations Officers. All farmers listed as cooperators were personally contacted by the interviewer for purposes of verifying the list for determining the actual number and identity of farmers assisted under the program. A survey listing schedule was accomplished by the interviewer for this purpose.

The sample cooperators selected were interviewed for the information asked in a prepared farm household schedule.

Information about the team members and their activities were also collected by the survey supervisors by accomplishing a schedule prepared for this purpose. The interview of the members of the team was done simultaneously with the enumeration of the sample farms.

Sample Size:

Table 1: Number of sample farmers interviewed
by province, 1966

Province	: Assisted : Unassisted : Non-cooperator : TOTAL
	:Coop.rators :Cooperators
Nueva Ecija	: 60 : 41 : 1 : 102
Laguna	: 286 : 75 : 77 : 438
TOTAL	: : 116 : 78 : 540

Area covered and assignment of production teams

Table 2: Area covered and number of teams fielded,
by province, 1966

Province	Area coverage (hectares)			Number of teams	
	Proposed ^{a/}	Reported ^{b/}	As verified ^{c/}	Proposed ^{a/}	Actual ^{c/}
N. Ecija	5,790(100)	3,090 (53)	2,050 (35)	39 (100)	19 (49)
Laguna	10,600(100)	9,840 ^{d/} (93)	8,670 (82)	71 (100)	66 (93)
TOTAL	16,390(100)	12,930 (79)	10,720 (65)	110 (100)	85 (77)

Figures in () are percentages of the proposed

a/ - Obtained from the brochure on the IRPP

b/ - Based on reports of production teams

c/ - Based on the results of the survey

d/ - Does not include areas covered by 5 teams

Table 2 shows that out of the program target area of 16,390 hectares, only 10,720 hectares or approximately 65 percent was actually covered. While 82 percent of the target area was covered in Laguna, only a little more than 1/3 or 35 percent of the proposed program area was actually covered in Nueva Ecija. On the otherhand, out of the 110 production teams proposed to service the project areas in the two provinces, only 85 or approximately 77 percent were actually fielded.

The area covered as verified during the survey represents approximately 83 percent of the reported coverage of production technicians.

Program cooperators

Table 3: Classification of cooperators as verified during the survey, by province, 1966

Province	Number of cooperators					
	Total reported	Assisted	Un-assisted	No palagad crop	Not located or identified	Listed twice
N. Ecija	1,424(100)	566(40)	677(47)	122(9)	32 (2)	27 (2)
Laguna	4,364(100)	2,864(66)	936(21)	248(6)	229 (5)	87 (2)
TOTAL	5,788(100)	3,430(59)	1,613(28)	370(6)	261 (5)	114 (2)

Note: Figures in () are percentages of the total reported.

The above table shows that there is inaccuracy in the lists prepared by the production teams. Out of the 5,788 cooperators listed in the two provinces, 631 or approximately 11 percent either did not plant palagad this year or could not be located or identified. Farmers listed twice by a particular production team or listed separately by two individual teams aggregated 114 or about 2 percent of the total.

Survey indications also show that 1,613 or approximately 28 percent of the listed program-cooperators in the two provinces did not receive any form of assistance under the program.

In Nueva Ecija, the survey results also reflect that out of 566 program - assisted cooperators, 182 or about 32 percent were assisted either through the landlord or the overseer.

General Impact of the Program and Types of Assistance Extended

1. Production

Table 4: Palay (palagad) - Yield per hectare in the project areas this year compared with that of last year, by province, 1966

Item	: Sample Indications a/			: As reported by technicians b/		
	: 1966	: 1965	: Increase	: 1966	: 1965	: Increase
	:(44 kg : sk)	:(44 kg : sk)	(decrease) : Percent	:(44 kgs : sk)	:(44 kg : sk)	(decrease) : Percent
N. Ecija	:	:	:	:	:	:
Assisted	: 40.4	: 37.8	: 7	: 47.7	: 35.5	: 34
Unassisted	: 38.1	: 39.8	: (4)	:	:	:
Non-cooperator	: -	: -	: -	:	:	:
Laguna	:	:	:	:	:	:
Assisted	: 55.6	: 52.3	: 6	: 57.5	: 47.8	: 20
Unassisted	: 51.1	: 50.4	: 1	:	:	:
Non-cooperator	: 56.6	: 50.6	: 12	:	:	:

a/ - Based on the survey

b/ - Unweighted arithmetic average. This is also based on interviews of Production Technicians during the survey.

The above results of the survey indicate an increase in the yield per hectare by about 2.6 cavans or 7 percent over that of last year in the assisted areas in Nueva Ecija. Incidentally, the crop yield in the assisted areas in Laguna also increased by about the same magnitude. However, while the yield in the unassisted areas in Nueva Ecija diminished by about 1.7 cavans per hectare, an increment of about 0.3 cavan per hectare was registered in Laguna.

It is interesting to note that the survey reports revealed an increase in yield from that of last year in the areas operated by non-cooperators by about 6 cavans per hectare or about 3 cavans more than what was harvested in the assisted areas. Does this situation points to discredit the implementation of the program

in Laguna? Will it prove that there was actually no necessity for the program to be implemented in Laguna? Tables 4 and 5 could provide the answer in a very general way. In one way, the paradox may be explained by the survey reports which show that the areas covered by non-cooperators are better irrigated than the program areas.

On the other hand, reports of the production technicians in Nueva Ecija and Laguna reflected an overall increase from that of last year in yield per hectare in the project areas by about 34 percent and 20 percent, respectively.

Table 5: Number of team coverages reporting yield per hectare of 40 cavans or more, and number of sample farmers using fertilizer, insecticides etc., by province, 1966

Item	: Number of : team : coverage	: Total : farms : reporting	: Number of sample farmers that -		
			: Used : fertilizer	: Sprayed : field	: Received : farm advice
N. Ecija	:	:	:	:	:
Assisted	: 9	: 29	: 26 (90)	: 13 (45)	: 23 (79)
Unassisted	: 7	: 18	: 10 (56)	: 2 (11)	: -
Non-cooperators	: 1	: 1	: 1 (100)	: -	: -
Laguna	:	:	:	:	:
Assisted	: 52	: 228	: 158 (69)	: 186 (82)	: 218 (96)
Unassisted	: 37	: 58	: 42 (72)	: 35 (60)	: -
Non-cooperators	: 38	: 65	: 45 (69)	: 42 (65)	: 13 (20)

Figures in () are percentages of the total farms reporting.

Table 6: Number of team coverages reporting yield per hectare below 40 cavans, and number of sample farmers using fertilizer, insecticides etc., by province, 1966

Item	:Number of : team : coverage	: Total : farms : reporting	: Number of sample farmers that - : Used : fertilizer	: Sprayed : field	: Received : farm advice
N. Ecija	:	:	:	:	:
Assisted	: 10	: 31	: 17 (55)	: 10 (32)	: 25 (81)
Unassisted	: 8	: 23	: 7 (30)	: 5 (22)	: -
Non-cooperators:	: -	: -	: -	: -	: -
Laguna	:	:	:	:	:
Assisted	: 14	: 58	: 39 (67)	: 37 (64)	: 56 (97)
Unassisted	: 9	: 17	: 10 (59)	: 9 (53)	: -
Non-cooperators:	: 10	: 12	: 5 (42)	: 7 (58)	: 1 (8)

Figures in () are percentages of the total farms reporting.

In either province, it is evident, as shown in Tables 5 and 6 that the yield per hectare is directly proportional to the number and intensity of technical inputs applied to a particular area. A cursory examination of the tables will reveal that users of fertilizer, insecticides and staunch supporters of the government's campaign for modern farm practices are more predominant in the areas producing 40 or more cavans per hectare than in those areas producing less.

2. Certified Seeds

Table 7: Number of sample farmers who used and did not use certified seeds in 1966 palay palagad, by province

Province and kind of cooperator	Total Farms Reporting	Non-user Farms Reporting	User Farms Reporting
Nueva Ecija	102 (100)	99 (97)	3 (3)
Assisted	60 (100)	57 (95)	3 (5)
Unassisted	41 (100)	41 (100)	
Non-cooperator	1 (100)	1 (100)	
Laguna	438 (100)	389 (89)	49 (11)
Assisted	286 (100)	248 (87)	38 (13)
Unassisted	75 (100)	70 (93)	5 (7)
Non-cooperator	77 (100)	71 (92)	6 (8)

Figures in () are percentages of the total.

Table 8: Reasons for not using certified seeds: Number of sample farmers reporting, by kind of cooperator, reasons given and by province, 1966

Province and reasons	Total		Assisted		Unassisted		Non-cooperator	
	Farms	Percent- repor- ting	Farms	Percent- age dis- tribution	Farms	Percent- age dis- tribution	Farms	Percent- age dis- tribution
Nueva Ecija	99	100	57	100	41	100	1	100
Never heard	38	38	14	25	24	59		
Not available locally	56	57	40	70	15	37	1	100
Available but:								
Prohibitive price	3	3	2	3	1	2	-	-
Stocks arrived late	2	2	1	2	1	2	-	-
Laguna	389	100	248	100	70	100	71	100
Never heard	105	27	44	18	24	34	37	52
Not available locally	207	53	153	62	33	47	21	30
Available but:								
Prohibitive price	6	2	5	2	-	-	1	1
Stocks arrived late	5	1	5	2	-	-	-	-
No cash outlay	6	2	5	2	1	1	-	-
Limited supply	22	6	13	5	6	9	3	4
Not interested	19	5	9	4	4	6	6	9
Other reasons	2	a/	2	a/	-	-	-	-
No reason given	17	4	12	5	2	3	3	4

a/ Less than 1 percent

Table 7 shows that only 3 out of 102 farmers interviewed in Nueva Ecija used certified seeds. In Laguna, 49 or about 11 percent of the 438 farmers interviewed, planted certified seeds. Reasons given in table 7 by the farmers for not using certified seeds are indicative of the inadequacy of the seed program. About 38 percent, and 27 percent, of the farms reporting in Nueva Ecija and Laguna, respectively, claimed they have never heard about certified seeds. If certified seeds were then available under the program, the survey results reflect faulty distribution, since about 57 percent, and 53 percent, of the farms reporting in Nueva Ecija and Laguna, respectively, reported that certified seeds were not available locally.

3. General Assistance Extended

Table 9: Assistance extended by the team to farm cooperators, by province, 1966

Kind of assistance	Nueva Ecija			Laguna		
	Farms re- porting	Percen- tage dis- tribution		Farms re- porting	Percen- tage dis- tribution	
Total	60	100		286	100	
Personalized farm advice	21	35		201	70	
Free insecticides	6	10		7	3	
Certified seeds	2	3		1	a/	
Fertilizer at 20% sub- sidized price	2	3		-	-	
Credit assistance	-	-		1	a/	
Personalized farm advice and free insecticides	19	33		37	13	

a/ Less than 1 percent.

Table 9: (continuation)

Kind of assistance	Nueva Ecija		Laguna	
	Farms	Percen-	Farms	Percen-
	re- porting	tage dis- tribution	re- porting	tage dis- tribution
Personalized farm advice and fertilizer at 20% subsidized price	3	5	16	6
Personalized farm advice and credit assistance	-	-	6	3
Free insecticides and certified seeds	-	-	1	<u>a/</u>
Free insecticides and fertilizer at 20% subsidized price	2	3	1	<u>a/</u>
Free insecticides and credit assistance	-	-	1	<u>a/</u>
Personalized farm advice, free insecticides and fertilizer at 20% subsidized price	5	8	7	3
Personalized farm advice, free insecticides and credit assistance	-	-	2	1
Personalized farm advice, certified seeds and credit assistance	-	-	1	<u>a/</u>
Personalized farm advice, free insecticides, certified seeds, fertilizer at 20% subsidized price and credit assistance	-	-	4	1

a/ Less than 1 percent.

The above table does not seem to give proper weight to the implementation of the program in either province. The figures tend to show that operations under the program have been confined almost entirely to technical farm advice and pest and disease control, which also have been available to the farmers in previous years.

Out of the 60 assisted farmers interviewed in Nueva Ecija, 21 or about 35 percent, and 19 or about 33 percent, took advantage of farm advice and a combination of farm advice and free insecticides, respectively.

The table does not give much color to the credit program in either province.

In Laguna, out of 286 assisted farmers enumerated, 70 percent, and about 13 percent, were extended farm advice and a combination of farm advice and free insecticides, respectively.

As compared to no assistance on the combination of 4 or 5 input factors in Nueva Ecija, about 1 percent of the assisted cooperators interviewed in Laguna received assistance on the combination of 5 input factors, namely: (1) farm advice, (2) free insecticides, (3) certified seeds, (4) fertilizer and (5) credit.

4. Fertilizer

Table 10. - Number of sample farmers who used and who did not used fertilizer, by province, 1966

Province and kind of cooperator	T o t a l		Non-user		User	
	Farms report- ing	Percentage of the total	Farms report- ing	Percentage of the total	Farms report- ing	Percentage of the total
Nueva Ecija	102	100	41	40	61	60
Assisted	60	100	17	28	43	72
Unassisted	41	100	24	59	17	41
Non-cooperator	1	100			1	100
Laguna	438	100	139	32	299	68
Assisted	286	100	89	31	197	69
Unassisted	75	100	23	31	52	69
Non-cooperator	77	100	27	35	50	65

Table 11. - Reasons for not using fertilizer, by province, 1966

Province and reasons	T o t a l		Assisted		Unassisted		Non-cooperator	
	Farms report- ing	Percentage distribution	Farms report- ing	Percentage distribution	Farms report- ing	Percentage distribution	Farms report- ing	Percentage distribution
Nueva Ecija	41	100	17	100	24	100		
Not available locally	2	5			2	9		
Available but: Prohibitive price	11	27	4	23	7	29		
No cash outlay	7	17	3	18	4	17		
Stocks arrived late	3	7	1	6	2	8		
Don't want to use it	5	12	3	18	2	8		
No reason given	13	32	6	35	7	29		
Laguna	139	100	89	100	23	100	27	100
Not available locally	27	19	18	20	4	18	5	19
Available but: Prohibitive price	3	2	1	1	1	4	1	4
No cash outlay	16	12	10	11	3	13	3	11
Stocks arrived late	2	1	2	2				
Don't want to use it	44	32	23	26	9	39	12	44
Other reasons	7	5	5	6	2	9		
No reason given	40	29	30	34	4	17	6	22

As reflected in table 10, about 72 percent, and 68 percent, of the assisted cooperators interviewed in Nueva Ecija and Laguna, respectively, applied fertilizer on their farms. To some extent, this may be a good indication of the effects of the government's fertilizer program. On the contrary, table 11 will show that negative attitudes of farmers regarding the use of fertilizer is still revealing. About 53 percent, and 66 percent, of the assisted cooperators interviewed as non-users of fertilizers, in Nueva Ecija and Laguna, respectively, reported they do not want to use fertilizer for unspecified reasons. A significant number of non-user-survey respondents also claimed they do not want to use fertilizer because the cost of fertilizer is prohibitive or because they have no cash outlay.

Table 12. - Inorganic fertilizer applied in the program areas, quantity and source, by province, 1966 ^{a/}

Province and source	T o t a l		Assisted		Unassisted		Non-cooperator	
	Farms report- ing	Qty. (bags)	Farms report- ing	Qty. (bags)	Farms report- ing	Qty. (bags)	Farms report- ing	Qty. (bags)
Nueva Ecija	61 (100)	240	43 (100)	171	17 (100)	61	1 (100)	8
ACA/FACOMA	28 (46)	107	24 (56)	91	4 (24)	16		
BPI	1 (2)	3	1 (2)	3				
Private Store	32 (52)	130	18 (42)	77	13 (76)	45	1 (100)	8
Laguna	299 (100)	1253	197 (100)	912	52 (100)	199	50 (100)	142
ACA/FACOMA	31 (10)	310	27 (14)	300	1 (2)	3	3 (6)	7
Private Store	260 (87)	903	166 (84)	591	49 (94)	185	45 (90)	127
Landlord ^{b/}	8 (3)	40	4 (2)	21	2 (4)	11	2 (4)	8

Figure in () are percentages of total.

^{a/} Sample indications.

^{b/} Original source undetermined.

The above table shows that the predominant source of fertilizer used in the program areas is - the private source. About 52 percent and 87 percent of the fertilizer - users interviewed in Nueva Ecija and Laguna, respectively, procured fertilizer from private dealers.

5. Credit Facilities

Table 13. - Sources of loans of sample farmers, by province, 1966

Province and source	: Total : farms : reported:	Number of sample farmers		
		: Assisted	: Un- : assisted	: Non- : cooperators
Nueva Ecija	: 102	: 60	: 41	: 1
ACA or FACOMA	: 1 (1)	: 1 (2)	: -	: -
Commercial or Rural	: 6 (6)	: 4 (7)	: 2 (5)	: -
Banks	: -	: -	: -	: -
DBP	: 14 (14)	: 14 (23)	: -	: -
Landlord	: 74 (73)	: 45 (75)	: 29 (71)	: -
Private persons	: 1 (1)	: -	: 1 (2)	: -
Not specified				
Laguna	: 438	: 286	: 75	: 77
ACA or FACOMA	: 32 (7)	: 20 (7)	: 12 (16)	: -
Commercial or Rural	: 20 (4)	: 15 (5)	: 3 (4)	: 2 (3)
Banks	: 1 (a/)	: 1 (a/)	: -	: -
DBP	: 207 (47)	: 144 (50)	: 28 (37)	: 35 (45)
Landlord	: 112 (26)	: 86 (30)	: 15 (20)	: 11 (14)
Private persons				

Figures in () are percentages of the total.

a/ Less than 1 percent.

Table 14. - Reasons for not securing loans from ACA: Number of farms reporting by kind of cooperator and province, 1966

Province and reasons	(Number)			
	Total	Assisted	Unassisted	Non-cooperator
Nueva Ecija	101	59	41	1
No collateral	21 (21)	12 (20)	9 (22)	
Processing of loans too long	43 (43)	26 (44)	17 (41)	
Have not heard of it	50 (49)	27 (46)	22 (54)	1 (100)
Untimely release	26 (26)	13 (22)	13 (32)	
Not interested	7 (7)	7 (12)		
Other reasons	1 (1)	1 (2)		
Laguna	406	266	63	77
No collateral	78 (19)	58 (22)	9 (14)	11 (14)
Processing of loans too long	85 (21)	63 (24)	10 (16)	12 (16)
Have not heard of it	30 (7)	19 (7)	5 (8)	6 (8)
Untimely release	65 (16)	46 (17)	9 (14)	10 (13)
Not interested	173 (43)	98 (37)	40 (63)	35 (45)
Other reasons	39 (10)	27 (10)	6 (10)	6 (8)

Figures in () are percentages of the total.

Table 15. - Reasons for preferring other sources: Number of farms reporting, by province, 1966

Province and reasons	(Number)			
	Total	Assisted	Unassisted	Non-cooperator
Nueva Ecija	102	60	41	1
Collateral not required	14 (14)	5 (8)	8 (20)	1 (100)
Absence of too much paper work	9 (9)	4 (7)	4 (10)	1 (100)
Cash is given on the spot	59 (58)	36 (60)	22 (54)	1 (100)
Laguna	438	286	75	77
Collateral not required	48 (11)	32 (11)	11 (15)	5 (6)
Absence of too much paper work	52 (12)	37 (13)	7 (9)	8 (10)
Cash is given on the spot	87 (20)	59 (21)	17 (23)	11 (14)
Other reasons	49 (11)	28 (10)	16 (21)	5 (6)

Figures in () are percentages of the total.

As shown in the above tables, the sources of credit in the program areas are predominantly the unregistered sources - private sources and the landlords.

A significant proportion of the respondents reported that they prefer sources other than the ACA because, while processing of loans by the ACA is too long, other sources give cash on the spot.

Dessimination of information regarding the existence of the credit program was apparently inadequate as the survey results reflect about 49 percent, and about 7 percent, of the farmers interviewed in Nueva Ecija and Laguna, respectively, have not heard about the said program (Table 14).

6. Irrigation

Table 16. - Opinions on the supply of irrigation water this palagad scason as compared to last year, by province, 1966

Province and comparison	T o t a l		Assisted		Unassisted		Non-cooperator	
	Farms : report- ing	Perce- tage dis- tribution	Farms : report- ing	Perce- tage dis- tribution	Farms : report- ing	Perce- tage dis- tribution	Farms : report- ing	Perce- tage dis- tribution
Nueva Ecija	102	100	60	100	41	100	1	100
Less	21	20	11	18	10	24	-	-
Same	46	45	32	53	14	34	-	-
More	13	13	6	10	7	17	-	-
Much more	3	3	2	4	1	3	-	-
No comment	19	19	9	15	9	22	1	100
Laguna	438	100	286	100	75	100	77	100
Much less	36	8	28	10	4	5	4	5
Less	88	20	51	18	22	29	15	19
Same	230	53	151	53	37	50	42	55
More	49	11	30	10	7	9	12	16
Much more	29	7	21	7	5	7	3	4
No comment	6	1	5	2	-	-	1	1

Opinions of farmers gathered during the survey reflect that there is lesser supply of irrigation water this year compared with that of last year in either province. Of the total farms reporting in Laguna, about 28 percent reported "less" or "much less" and only 18 percent reported "more" and "much more".

It is interesting to note that the survey indications show that the areas operated by non-cooperators are better irrigated than those of the assisted cooperators. The survey figures (shown in table 16) show that only 24 percent of the non-cooperators interviewed reported "less" and "much less" compared to 28 percent for the assisted. Furthermore, 20 percent of the non-cooperator-respondents reported "more" and "much more" against only 18 percent for the assisted areas.

7. Pest and Disease Control

Table 17. - Number of sample farmers who sprayed their farms, by province, 1966

I t e m	: Total : farms : reported	: <u>Number of sample farmers who</u>	
		: Sprayed their : farms	: Did not spray : their farms
Nueva Ecija	: 102 (100):	: 30 (29)	: 72 (71)
Assisted	: 60 (100):	: 23 (38)	: 37 (62)
Unassisted	: 41 (100):	: 7 (17)	: 34 (83)
Non-cooperator	: 1 (100):	: -	: 1 (100)
Laguna	: 438 (100):	: 316 (72)	: 122 (28)
Assisted	: 286 (100):	: 223 (78)	: 63 (22)
Unassisted	: 75 (100):	: 44 (59)	: 31 (41)
Non-cooperator	: 77 (100):	: 49 (64)	: 28 (36)

Figures in () are percentages of the total.

Table 18. - Reasons for not using insecticides or pesticides, etc., by province, 1966

Province and reasons	Total farms reporting	Number of sample farmers that did not spray their farms		
		Assisted	Unassisted	Non-cooperator
Nueva Ecija	72 (100)	37 (100)	34 (100)	1 (100)
Chemicals not available	3 (4)	3 (8)	-	-
Available, but:				
Prohibitive price	3 (4)	2 (5)	-	1 (100)
No cash outlay	11 (15)	6 (16)	5 (15)	-
Limited supply	2 (3)	2 (5)	-	-
Not interested	13 (18)	6 (16)	7 (21)	-
No sprayer	15 (21)	7 (19)	8 (24)	-
Others	21 (29)	9 (24)	12 (35)	-
No reasons given	28 (39)	19 (51)	9 (26)	-
Laguna	122 (100)	63 (100)	35 (100)	28 (100)
Chemicals not available	11 (9)	8 (13)	2 (6)	1 (4)
Available but:				
Prohibitive price	2 (2)	1 (2)	1 (3)	-
No cash outlay	8 (7)	5 (8)	2 (6)	1 (4)
Limited supply	8 (7)	5 (8)	1 (3)	2 (7)
Not interested	40 (33)	17 (27)	13 (42)	10 (36)
No sprayer	18 (15)	19 (30)	4 (13)	5 (18)
Others	9 (7)	4 (6)	4 (13)	1 (4)
No reasons given	26 (21)	18 (29)	4 (13)	4 (14)

Figures in () are percentages of the total.

The results of the survey as demonstrated in table 17 show that 316 or about 72 percent of the 438 farmers interviewed in Laguna sprayed farm chemicals on their farms, in contrast to only 29 percent of the 102 farmer-respondents in Nueva Ecija. While these figures could mean that the pest and disease control

program was better implemented in Laguna, it could also be interpreted as an indication of lesser prevalence of pest and disease infestation in Nueva Ecija. In fact, more respondents in the province than in Laguna reported that they were not interested to spray their farms or they deliberately did not spray for no given reasons. While the preceding statement may not be conclusive for lack of other facts, general findings of survey supervisors attest that, in most instances, there was really no need for spraying in some of the program areas in Nueva Ecija.

On the other hand, the survey reports indicated about 21 percent of the respondents in Nueva Ecija did not spray their farms because of lack of spraying equipment. Moreover, about 15 percent reported they have no cash to buy farm chemicals.

SUMMARY OF GENERAL FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The results of the survey show that only 65 percent of the program target area in Laguna and Nueva Ecija was actually covered. There were only 85 production teams fielded which represented 77 percent of the total number of teams proposed for the two provinces.
2. Lists of cooperators prepared and reported by the production teams are not accurate. Only 59 percent of the total cooperators reported for both provinces were actually assisted.

Other salient findings on the verification of said list of cooperators are as follows:

a. The lists do not provide information on the residence of cooperators. This situation entailed difficulties in the verification work because many farms are located in one barrio but the operator resides in another barrio.

b. There have been found farmers listed twice by a particular team and some farmers appearing in the lists of two production teams, especially when two adjoining barrios are covered by two separate production teams.

c. There are non-farming and/or farming households with no palagad crop listed as program-cooperators.

d. Some production technicians were only furnished a list of program-cooperators by the overseer so that the said technicians seem to have no knowledge of their residence and location of their farms.

e. There are names listed as cooperators whose identity could never be verified.

3. Based on the survey indications, an increase of about 3 cavans per hectare compared with that of last year's level was attained in the assisted areas in either province. On the other hand, reports of the production technicians reflected increases of about 10 cavans per hectare in Laguna and about 12 cavans in Nueva Ecija. Considering that either of the two estimates is the true figure, offhand it could be concluded that the program-

objectives of attaining 20 cavans per hectare increase have not been fully achieved.

Furthermore, the results of the survey tend to show that farmers in Laguna have already reached that stage wherein they could stand to increase their production even without the benefit of external assistance. The survey indications show that the non-cooperators (those who did not receive any form of assistance under the program) achieved improvements in yield by about 50 percent more than what was attained by the assisted cooperators.

4. Only an insignificant proportion of the cooperators made use of certified seeds. The program on certified seeds was apparently inadequate as most of the non-users reported that they have never heard about certified seeds or certified seeds were not locally available.

5. The survey results reflected increases in crop yields in proportion to the number of input factors applied in the farm. However, the findings show that only an insignificant number of cooperators were extended a combination of more than 3 out of the 5 input factors provided under the program. It was observed that operations under the IRPP have been confined almost entirely to pest and disease control and technical farm advice given to farmers, which also have been available to them during the preceding years.

6. The average yield in the assisted areas in Nueva Ecija

and Laguna are estimated to be about 40.4 cavans and 55.6 cavans per hectare, respectively.

Out of the 286 assisted cooperators interviewed in Laguna, 228 or about 80 percent reported yields per hectare of about 40 cavans or over. On the other hand, only 29 or about 48 percent of the 60 assisted farmers interviewed in Nueva Ecija attained yields per hectare of 40 cavans or over.

The relatively higher yield registered in Laguna may reflect the indications of more assistance extended under the program in that province than in Nueva Ecija.

7. About 70 percent of the program cooperators applied fertilizer on their crop in both provinces. The main reasons given by "non-users of fertilizers" for not applying fertilizer are:

- a. prohibitive price of fertilizer
- b. not available locally

and if available, the stocks arrived late and c. do not want to use fertilizer for unspecified reasons.

The predominant sources of fertilizer used in the program areas were the private dealers.

8. Only an insignificant number of cooperators took advantage of the credit facilities of the ACA. The survey results showed that they prefer other sources (landlords, private dealers, etc.) because some reported, processing of loans by the ACA is too long and others say they have never heard about the loaning facilities of the ACA. Moreover, the farmers prefer sources

who could provide cash on the spot.

9. In view of the problems demonstrated by the results of the survey, the following measures are recommended to be instituted in the implementation aspects of all programs of the same import and objectives:

a. There is a need for close and strict supervision of production technicians and other technicians charged with the implementation of the program at the lowest operational level. A close look at the experience gained in the survey, not a few production technicians could be contacted in their field assignments or barrio office at the time they were supposed to be there. This fact is based on general findings of the survey supervisors and clearly attested by the farmers themselves who are to stand to lose most under the situation.

b. An intensive training of all personnel involved in the program should be instituted. A number of technicians when interviewed by the survey supervisors could hardly distinguish the IRPP from the previous rice production programs nor could they define properly their role under the program. Under this situation it could hardly be expected that these same technicians could render services effectively and in the right direction.

c. Similar programs should be provided with a timely and adequate logistic support. The program for the use of improved or certified seeds was not implemented effectively because most of

the crop has been planted when the program was initiated. Fertilizer supplies were not available in ACA outlets at the period propitious for its application in most instances. Where these were available, farmers were not in a position to buy since the proposed credit facilities under the program were not available in most instances.

10. Lastly, but not least, it is recommended that the conduct of an evaluation survey should be on a continuing basis and that the appropriation for the undertaking should be well provided.

A P P E N D I X - A

COMPOSITION OF THE
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EVALUATION SURVEYS

Chairman:

Dr. Tito Mijares
Director - Bureau of the Census and Statistics

Vice-Chairman:

Prof. Jose Gutierrez
UP Statistical Center

Executive Secretary & Survey Project Leader

Mr. Jose V. Castillo
Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Members:

Dr. Amando M. Dalisay
Rice and Corn Administration

Dr. Burton T. Oñate
International Rice Research Institute

Dr. Emilio Quintana
UP College of Agriculture

Liaison Officer:

Mr. Mamerto Damasco
Bureau of Agricultural Economics

APPENDIX - B

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE RICE AND CORN ADMINISTRATION AND THE BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS, DANR ON THE CONDUCT OF AN EVALUATION SURVEY OF THE INTENSIFIED RICE PRODUCTION PROGRAM

WHEREAS under the Rice and Corn Production Coordinating Council an intensified rice production program was launched with the ultimate goal of producing enough rice to meet the growing consumption requirements of the country;

WHEREAS in the said intensified program, a program of expenditure for the financing of technical inputs in the rice areas and of personnel utilization has been agreed upon by various agencies concerned;

WHEREAS there is an urgent need for assessing the effectivity and efficiency of such expenditures in relation to production returns achieved, as a guide to the formulation and conduct of future programs towards the same objectives;

WHEREAS the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the agency charged with the responsibility for such evaluation, possesses the necessary personnel with technical competence and experience, but owing to lack of funds is not in a position to undertake such evaluation;

WHEREAS the Rice and Corn Administration, as the agency charged with price stabilization and the maintenance of an adequate supply of staple foods, has the most immediate need for such data as will be afforded by an evaluation survey;

WHEREAS the Rice and Corn Administration can provide the necessary funds for undertaking such a survey;

WHEREAS an Advisory Committee composed of experts and recognized leaders in the field of scientific researches and statistical surveys shall be constituted to review the guidelines and plans for proposed evaluation surveys to be undertaken by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics with a view to assessing objectively all agricultural development programs;

NOW, THEREFORE, the Rice and Corn Administration and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics hereby agree to make

26

MEMO OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN RCA
AND THE BAE ON EVALUATION SURVEY

Page - 2 -

possible and facilitate the conduct of such a survey under the following conditions, to wit:

1. The Rice and Corn Administration shall transfer to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics sufficient funds to defray the costs of evaluation surveys in the form of cash advance to Mr. Jose V. Castillo, Chief Statistician of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, who is hereby designated as Project Leader of any project on evaluation of the "Intensified Rice and Corn Production Program" and who shall be accountable for the funds transferred.
2. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics shall formulate operating procedures and administrative guidelines for the project, subject to the review of an Advisory Committee established for the purpose and in consultation with the RCA Officer assigned to the project.
3. The Director of the BAEcon. upon the request of the Project Leader, may draw adequate and appropriate number of personnel from the agencies connected with the program to be detailed to the project, subject to the approval of the heads of the agencies concerned.
4. The funds required for the evaluation surveys for the pilot program involving 45,000 hectares should not exceed P15,000. All disbursements from said funds approved and transferred as per (1) above shall be authorized by the Project Leader and approved by the Director of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, subject to existing rules and regulations on disbursements and expenditures of government funds.
5. The Project Leader shall render such preliminary reports, as may be deemed essential by the RCA Chairman-General Manager and a final report on the survey results, copies to be furnished the members of the Advisory Committee and the Director of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, WE, the Chairman-General Manager of the Rice and Corn Administration and the Director of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics hereby affix our signatures on this 31st day of May, 1966 at Diliman, Quezon City.

(SGD) OSMUNDO MONDONEDO
Chairman-General Manager
Rice and Corn Administration

(SGD) THOMAS J. CABRIAS
Officer-in-Charge
Bureau of Agricultural Economics

A True Copy:

29